

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI
EASTERN DIVISION

RICCARDO CROSSLAND,)
)
Plaintiff,)
)
v.) No. 4:12-CV-2254-TCM
)
)
MELVIN SKEEN, et al.,)
)
)
Defendants.)

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

This matter is before the Court upon review of plaintiff's amended complaint [Doc. #6].

Plaintiff originally filed his action with another inmate, Keith E. Brown-El. *See Brown-El v. Skeen*, 4:12-CV-1680-FRB (E.D. Mo.). The Court struck plaintiff Crossland from that action, explaining that prisoners proceeding in forma pauperis may not join together under Rule 20 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, and ordered the Clerk of Court to open a separate case for him, which is the instant action. On December 20, 2012, after the instant case was opened, plaintiff was ordered to file an amended complaint that complied with the Court's Memorandum and Order [Doc. #5]. Specifically, the court set forth detailed instructions as to what the amended complaint and the "Statement of Claim" should contain. The Court further ordered that if plaintiff

failed to comply, this action would be dismissed without prejudice and without further notice to him.

Plaintiff has failed to comply with this Court's Order of December 20. Plaintiff, again, is attempting to join with other inmates in bringing this action. On page 5(A) of the amended complaint [Doc. #6, page 6 of 18], plaintiff states, "As noted there are three (3) named plaintiffs, however - inclusive here/w are two (2) other claims . . . which plaintiffs seek class certification status for." Moreover, in the "Statement of Claim," plaintiff was instructed to start by typing the first defendant's name, and under that name, he was to set forth in separate numbered paragraphs the allegations supporting his claim(s) as to that particular defendant, as well as the right(s) that he claims that particular defendant violated. Plaintiff was instructed to proceed in this manner with each of the named defendants, separately setting forth each individual name and under that name, in numbered paragraphs, the allegations specific to that particular defendant and the right(s) that he claims that particular defendant violated. Rather than comply with the Court's instructions, plaintiff has merely photocopied pages from the "Statement of Facts" in *Brown-El v. Skeen*, 4:12-CV-1680-FRB (E.D. Mo.), and included them as his "Statement of Facts" in the instant action. This does not comply with the Court's Order of December 20. The paragraphs are not sequentially numbered, and they are not structured in accordance with the Court's specific instructions. As such, this action will be dismissed.

Therefore,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that this action is **DISMISSED**, without prejudice, for plaintiff's failure to comply with this Court's Order of December 20, 2012. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b).

A separate Order of Dismissal shall accompany this Memorandum and Order.

Dated this 11th day of January, 2013.

/s/Jean C. Hamilton
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE